UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Our Too Masculine World - - - - - - - - - *Lydia G. Wentworth*

Mutualism For Increasing Democracy - - - - - - - - - *Leo Hirsch*

No Victory Is Complete - - - - - - - - - *Kenneth L. Patton*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXI NUMBER 10

Chicago, December, 1945

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Leo Hirsch: Free Lance Writer and Lecturer.

Kenneth L. Patton: Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin.

Sheldon Shepard: Minister of The People's Church of San Fernando, California; author of *Peace of Mind in Time of War.*

Lydia G. Wentworth: Long-time friend of UNITY and frequent contributor to its columns.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 131
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 134

ARTICLES—

Our Too Masculine World—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH 134
Mutualism For Increasing Democracy—LEO HIRSCH 136
No Victory Is Complete—KENNETH L. PATTON 138

POETRY—

The Faith of the Sea—SHELDON SHEPARD 133

STUDY TABLE—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 142

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 144

THE FIELD—

Civil Liberty—*Chicago Civil Liberties Committee* 130

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Civil Liberty

We stand on the general principle that all matters of public concern should be freely discussed without interference. Orderly social progress is promoted by unrestricted freedom of agitation and organization. The punishment or prohibition of mere words unrelated to overt acts is never in the interest of democracy.

The principle of freedom of speech, press, and assembly, embodied in our constitutional law, must be constantly reasserted and applied to be made effective. It must be interpreted in relation to the various methods used to repress minority ideas and movements.

The Committee does not seek to bind its members to any precise definition of civil liberty, nor does it presume to censor their dissents from any policy. Even the members of its Board of Directors take varying positions on border-line issues.

1. Free Speech

There should be no control whatever in advance over what any person may say. The right to meet on private property and to speak freely should be unquestioned. Meetings in public places may properly be regulated by permit but without any discrimination whatever on account of the political program or views expressed. The fullest freedom of speech should be encouraged by setting aside places in streets or parks for use without permits, and in the use of public buildings for public meetings of any sort.

There should be no prosecutions for utterances on matters of public concern, however radical, however violent, or however offensive to special groups or interests. Prosecutions should be brought only for acts or attempted acts and language specifically inciting to the commission of such acts or where a "clear and present danger" of illegal acts exists. Libel and slander, as private offenses, are of course excepted from this principle. So, too, but with more difficulties, is "obscenity."

Radio, as the most influential means of communication, should be wholly free of government censorship of programs, and so conducted as to guarantee equal facilities, to all sides of public controversies.

2. Free Press

There should be no censorship over the mails by the post office. If allegedly libelous, fraudulent, obscene, seditious or other illegal matter is being circulated, it should be seized by proper warrant through the prosecuting authorities and tried before a jury. The granting or revoking of second-class mailing privileges should have nothing whatever to do with a paper's opinions.

There should be no control over the distribution of literature at meetings or hand to hand in public or in private places. No system of licenses for distribution should be tolerated.

(*Continued on page* 142)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXXI DECEMBER, 1945 No. 10

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

These are distressing times in which we are living. Our hopes of peace are seeping away like water from a leaky tub. The Atlantic Charter seems as dead as King Henry IV's plan for a European union of nations. San Francisco remains only as a kind of symbol of high hopes dissolved into disillusion. The London Conference was like a nail driven hard and fast into a coffin. It is easy to blame Russia for the failure at London, which is worse than that at Versailles a quarter of a century ago—and she should be blamed. Molotov showed little intention of carrying out promises, and every intention of having his own imperialistic way. He was out to concede nothing and to grab everything. That of course is the old game that leads to war. But the real blame should be on ourselves, for ever imagining that we could get peace out of this miserable world struggle. We went into the war with our ears wide open to the cries of those who warned us. The America First movement, for all its grievous errors, told the truth when it insisted that nothing would be gained and much lost in taking up arms to participate in European conflicts. The pacifists said again and again that no good could come out of war—that to join in the fight would be to forfeit the world's last and best hope of peace. And they were right! But the people were confused and deeply disturbed—the militarists were determined—and President Roosevelt was committed to Britain's cause. So we went in. And now we are coming out into a world as nearly lost as history has ever known. What can we do in such a tragic crisis? Two lines of action are open before us. On the one hand we can withdraw as a nation from the foreign scene, and return to a policy of isolationism. It is not improbable that something along this line may be the next chapter in our history, as an expression of disgust if nothing more. On the other hand, we can use the enormous power of this country not to underwrite imperialistic policies made in London and Moscow, but to further a genuine internationalism as consistent with true Americanism as with the dream of "One World." To put it in concrete terms, we can be as frank and bold in the statesmanship of peace as Russia is frank and bold in her statesmanship of Soviet advantage. We can lead, in other words, and not merely follow along, supporting the schemes and paying the bills of rival powers competing for global supremacy. Of these alternatives, the latter is alone feasible and honorable. Now is our chance to save mankind!

II

So they are banning the books again in Germany! Yes, the Allied powers, in imitation of the excellent example of Adolf Hitler in 1933! A special dispatch from Berlin to the New York *Herald-Tribune* brings the information that an index, or blacklist, of dead and living authors is being prepared which will include the names of all Nazi writers and those of 2,220 others who, although not National Socialists, are considered to be dangerous. According to the regulations already issued, the banned books may not be reprinted, sold in bookstores, or given out by libraries. The head of the Department of Peoples Education, who is in charge of this undertaking, concedes that no attempt will be made to search individual homes for forbidden works. If I remember rightly, this concession was granted also by Hitler—people were simply asked, or ordered, to bring forth their books and hand them over to the government. Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* will of course head the list of banned publications, and will be followed by the writings of all the lesser Nazi notables. Oswald Spengler's *Decline of the West* is damned as the philosophical forerunner of Nazism. Other names on the index are Heinrich von Treitschke, Sven Hedin, the pro-Nazi Swedish explorer, the famous Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the super-race theorist, and Knut Hamsun, the Norwegian Nobel Prize winner, whose great books *Growth of the Soil, Hunger,* and others, are absolutely non-political. But Hamsun was guilty at one time of expressing admiration for the principles of Nazism, and thus must be outlawed. No announcement has yet been made, so far as I know, of when and where these banned books will be burned. I take it for granted that this fiery ceremony will complete the

process of purgation, for it would be a pity for the Allies to fall short in any way of the Nazi standard. Thus is culture protected, freedom vindicated, and civilization made safe!

III

There are certain tests which are going to define the real character of the Labor government in England —whether it is going to create a new epoch in history, or repeat the melancholy tale of the MacDonald government of a decade and a half ago. The first test has already come and gone. It was Hong Kong, and here Attlee and his colleagues failed. They did exactly what Churchill and the Tories would have done had they still been in office—namely, snatched back this Chinese city and therewith declared that they had no intention of liquidating the British Empire. A second test, of course, is Palestine—more particularly the White Paper. Is the Labor cabinet going to continue the old policy, in appeasement of the Arabs, of shutting the gates to the Jews who want to return these days to Zion? Are they going to deny to these hundreds of thousands of Jews in starving Europe, who have no homes, no countries, the shelter waiting for them in the Holy Land? No temporizing will solve this problem. Either in defiance of the Arabs, or as Dr. Judah Magnes so eloquently and convincingly argues, in cooperation with them, the Jews must be allowed to enter Palestine. In any case, the White Paper must be withdrawn. A third test of the Labor government in London is India—the century-old problem of India. Here the issue is simple. Will Labor fall back upon the traditional evasion that the Indians must agree among themselves before dominion status, or freedom, is granted? Or will Labor bravely cut the Gordian knot, and deal frankly and openly with the All India National Congress which is the true representative of the Indian people? If there is dissension in India, it is largely because of the Empire which has long since learned how to "divide and rule." Jinnah, head of the Moslem League, is a notorious British build-up. With such policy, Labor, if it be sincere, can have nothing to do. The selection of Sir Pethick Lawrence, a liberal of the old school, as Secretary of State for India, is a good sign for the future. The India problem may soon be solved! Other questions loom large in England these trying days, especially in the domestic field. The Labor government must make good on its nationalization promises. But the real tests are those which I have named. We may all pray that the regrettable action at Hong Kong may not serve as example for the greater problems in Palestine and India. Here, in these two centers of prolonged crisis, Labor must come clean.

IV

The civil liberties record of the government in the war just closed was on the whole excellent, especially as compared with the first World War. But there were some dreadful mistakes! The worst of all was the rounding up of the Japanese-Americans on the West Coast, and the placing of these victims of American panic in concentration camps, euphemistically described as "redistribution centers." How terrible this action was is shown by Professor Rostow, of the Yale Law School, in his great article in the September *Harper's Magazine,* which spares nobody, from President Roosevelt and the Supreme Court down. The removal of the Japanese was as unconstitutional in law as it was unjust in ethics and un-American in politics. The story must remain forever a foul blot upon the escutcheon of our nation's history.

Another mistake was the prosecution and conviction of the Minnesota Socialists. This was a tragedy, all the darker in view of the participation of organized labor in the conspiracy against these men. A third mistake was the arrest and prosecution of the "seditionists" in Washington. This was not so much a tragedy as it was a farce-comedy, at once pitiful and hilarious. That the government could take seriously this aggregation of misguided and in the majority of cases semi-lunatic fanatics, is a dreadful commentary on its balanced judgment, to say nothing of its sense of humor. It is to be hoped that there is to be no repeat performance of this trial which ended in such a fiasco. Another unfortunate record is that of the conscientious objectors to war service. Here the government, I believe, was sincere and conscientious. It wanted to do the right and profitable thing by these men who would not fight and kill. It had a law which, while marking a great improvement over that enacted in the 1914-1918 conflict, was still very defective. In administering this law, the government, *and* the churches got into serious difficulties, and were not helped any by certain of the conscientious objectors and their advisors, who proved to be recalcitrant, uncooperative and selfish. The fact is that the C.P.S. camps were not a success. In contrast to this was the system of "detached service," in which the conscientious objectors were able to offer genuine public service and manifest the true qualities of sacrifice and good will which are their spiritual birthright. Had Congress not been stubborn and unenlightened, the men could have been sent abroad to feed the hungry, shelter the homeless, and care for the sick. In all the failure in this field there is still enough success to point the way to wise policy if, when, and as there is another war. These are some of the mistakes committed by the government during the war years. They are to be lamented—and their lessons learned for the uncertain future on before.

V

I want to say a good word for Bilbo. Yes, Bilbo, the Senator from the deep South; Bilbo the bigot and blatherskite. I praise him not as a man or as an offi-

cial, but, sociologically speaking, as a useful vent for passions and perversions which would otherwise be hidden away and fester like a sore. For Bilbo is speaking what unhappy millions of obscure men and women are thinking and feeling, and thus revealing the exact nature of the problem of prejudice by which we are confronted in this country. The *Christian Science Monitor* puts it admirably in a recent editorial:

> The Senator's egregious words stand as no more than incidental effects of forces immeasurably more important than the vulgarity of their verbiage or the personality of their author. Americans urgently need to understand more clearly what is at work.

It is in this sense that Bilbo fulfills so highly useful a social function. Here is what this vile thing, prejudice, really is. Most people do not express it in this open and violent fashion. Many people, scorning the Jew, despising the Negro, hating the foreigner, preserve a certain amenity of good manners, like Iago in his villainy. But here in Bilbo the whole veneer of culture is stripped away, and we see prejudice in all its native and naked savagery. Nothing now is hidden or disguised. The disgusting thing is here for all of us to see. And how do you like it, Sir and Madam? This is the anti-Semitism you are nursing in your own respectable bosoms. These indecencies and insults are the pure logic of the snobbish sentiments which are the guiding principles of your lives. You would not invite Bilbo to your dining table—you would not willingly be seen in his company. Yet he is the megaphone of your voice—his speeches are the translation into billingsgate of your politer language. So let Bilbo talk his head off! Let him be reported as freely and fully as possible. Let all the people listen to his filthy words. And perhaps in time a great shame will possess this nation. Citizens everywhere, north and south, will wake up to what they are doing in fearing and despising their fellowmen. And a great revulsion will seize upon them, not only to rid the public forum of Bilbo, but to cast out of their own souls the demons that are hidden there. So Bilbo has his uses. He is a convincing object-lesson of evil.

VI

Revivalism of the crassest, crudest, and most ignorant type is coming back fast in the wake of the war. The most conspicuous illustration of the movement at the moment is the Youth for Christ campaign. Great meetings are being held all over the country for the conversion of young people. On a single Saturday night there are as many as five hundred meetings attracting 500,000 people in as many different communities. A writer in *Collier's* calls it the "Bobby-Soxers Find the Saw-Dust Trail." Harold E. Fey recently wrote up the movement in a sensational article in the *Christian Century,* but nothing he said compared in vividness with a recent exhibition in New York City. A meeting was held in the Madison Square Garden, home of the circus, the rodeo, prize fights, and political rallies. The place was packed with a great host of boys and girls. Where did they come from? There was much enthusiastic gospel singing, and plenty of preaching and praying. The chief purpose of the meeting, apart from saving souls, was to expose and attack the doctrine of evolution. It was the old Bryan stuff again, only more ignorant and vulgar than anything the Great Commoner ever presented. And the youngsters ate it up! One may well speculate as to whether these impressionable young people are not better off at such a meeting than swooning at a Frank Sinatra concert, or jigging and jazzing at a night club, or strolling the sidewalks of Broadway. But why must such religious influence be associated with such appalling ignorance and superstition as beset this meeting from the first moment to the last? Another aspect of this new fundamentalism is found in the Bible schools that pepper the country in the summertime. Thousands of boys and girls attend these schools in summer camps and even in the hot cities, and hear the Bible expounded according to the principles of the Dark Ages. From the West Coast comes the interesting report that the Fundamentalists are moving in on the Released Time Education program, and thus evangelizing the public schools. The radio, of course, is being used to the limit. Illiterate exhorters crowd the air, child vocalists float their songs on the ether waves, and prayers mount high to heaven. What an exhibition! Professor Eduard C. Lindemann calls it "a new kind of mischief by the name of religion." "Mischief" it certainly is, but hardly "new." On the contrary, it is the old primitive religion come to life again—one more demonstration of how straight and sure war carries man back to savagery. I suppose that this recrudescence of revivalism must run its course. Liberalism seems to be doing little to stay the flood. But reason is not without avail. The frothing and foaming waves surge upon the surface of the sea, but far down in quiet reigns the eternal deep. We may well be disgusted, but not discouraged.

The Faith of the Sea

I hold the nations together and make highways for their traffic
I lift their heaviest burdens and let them slip easily from shore to shore.
To their sails I am a help and their propellers I rush forward.
My smile is the track of human intercourse;
My song the hum of their business and pleasure.
I offer myself to men—
To make their lives abundant;
To carry to him who lacks in exchange for that of which he has too much;
To teach each another's songs
And sustain him with another's faith.
Knowing what will be, my tide and wave roll on,
Waiting—
Waiting till man shall learn why I am here.

SHELDON SHEPARD.

Jottings

"Hen House Used for Church."
Headline in newspaper.

Well, this is considerably better than using church for hen house!

What is man going to do with the atomic bomb? Well, what did he do with the aeroplane? This is at least a suggestion of an answer to the most fateful question of our time.

Years ago, in his book, *The Time Machine,* Mr. H. G. Wells told a story of a whole race of men who delved in the earth and went underground to live. Is this another one of those Wellsian forecasts that are coming so true in our time?

The first World War was fought to end war. The second World War was fought to end totalitarianism. We do not seem to succeed very well with our wars!

General Eichelberger, on duty with General MacArthur in Japan, says that experience has brought him to the conclusion that "there are no inferior people, but only inferior governments." Good! I wish that there were a lot of other Americans on duty in Japan. But would they learn?

Bevin, the British Foreign Secretary, is a better proletarian than Commissar Molotov. The former has come up from the ranks of labor, and the latter is hopelessly middle-class. Perhaps a little more genuine proletarianism would do the Soviets a lot of good.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Our Too Masculine World

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH

How long has the world given lip service to the cause of world peace? A prophet of old told of the time to come when "they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruninghooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." But in all the long centuries since then, what men as rulers have kept their people at peace and have striven for peace with neighboring nations and throughout the world?

Centuries before the saying of the prophet, a queen of Egypt ruled who can be taken as typical of what women would do if they had the power today possessed by men. She was Queen Hatshepsut and she kept her country at peace after it had long groaned under the burden of wars engaged in by ambitious kings. So under her firm reign Egypt became peaceful and prosperous and its people adored their peace-minded, powerful Queen. Her strong character and determination to prevent war may well be an example to our women of today, for the time has come for women to assert themselves decisively if this desolated and grief-stricken world is to become the abode of a lasting peace.

It is doubtful if an officer in the army or the navy or a soldier or sailor could be found who would admit that he believes in war—approves of war—yet all of them are ready to carry it on when occasion arises. Almost everybody, if the subject is broached, will tell you, "we are all pacifists at heart," yet where are they who refuse to support war? None but a negligible number of men and women can be found who stand for their conviction that war is utterly unnecessary if human beings would use their reason, yet whose slowly growing power is regarded with suspicion and fear by the military and the powers that be—no one of whom will admit that he "believes in war."

That men are naturally more pugnacious than women is demonstrated day after day by police reports and newspaper items. Even the stately halls of Congress are occasionally enlivened by fisticuffs on the part of their somewhat elderly members. That is a bit startling, not to say shocking. Can we imagine women members pulling out each other's hair or knocking in each other's teeth?

It is conceded that the male animal is the fighting animal. Men are proud of their physical strength and have taken immense pleasure in demonstrating their prowess since the times of the Olympic games. But using that strength to force surrender of an opponent in an argument, or to decide a question of right or wrong, is manifestly to assume the attitude of a bully and to degrade the powers of both body and mind by working on the principle that "might makes right." Yet that is what mankind has been doing from time to time under greedy and ambitious leadership since history was first recorded. Facts are not always pleasant things to face and to acknowledge. But there are certain facts that must be faced and acknowledged if the world is ever to be rid of the curse of war.

I am not a misandrist. I enjoy the company of intelligent men as I do that of intelligent women. What I am going to say cannot be laid to dislike of the opposite sex. But I think a strong case can be made against the male element of humankind. Not misandry, then, impels me, but the conviction that certain well-known facts, which I shall state, ought to be considered as related to the present extremely unhappy and ominous condition of the world.

Fact Number One is that this is and has been from time immemorial a man's world. That is, society as constituted in communities, states, and nations, is organized and conducted, or governed, by men to the complete exclusion of half the human race—women. It is only in very recent years that women have begun to participate in affairs of state and nation. In other words, human society has been androcentric, dominated by the male viewpoint or attitude.

Fact Number Two is that, throughout the long centuries in which men have dominated in the affairs of

clans, tribes, states, and nations, wars have been frequent and a constant threat. Any person well read in history can recall lesser wars too numerous to mention between clans, tribes, and states, in addition to the larger wars waged specifically for conquest.

Fact Number Three is that wars have been fought because a man (or more than one) wanted to fight and had the power to enforce his will upon his more or less willing subjects. In other words, rulers were tyrants.

Fact Number Four is that, as the world has progressed slowly along the road toward civilization, wars, instead of diminishing, have increased in terror and ferocity, proving that as mankind has developed mentally, enabling him to make more scientific inventions and discoveries, men have deteriorated morally, since they have used those inventions and discoveries to the detriment of the world instead of to its progress and betterment.

Fact Number Five is that, as time has gone on and people have become more intelligent and approached nearer to a civilized condition, the common people have objected more and more strongly to warfare—to being obliged to offer their lives to settle the quarrels of their rulers. Yet the rulers—being men—stubborn, aggressive, and craving power, have continued to sacrifice the lives of their people by wars rather than to settle their disputes by reasonable methods.

Fact Number Six is that the true reasons for waging war in modern times have not been told to the people of the countries engaged in controversy, but that they have been fed with propaganda calculated to inflame their emotions and to make some of them willing to volunteer to fight for a purpose represented as exalted. Patriotism has always been stressed; and when there were not enough patriots willing to offer themselves as possible cannon fodder (as has usually been the case), the draft has been resorted to, and millions of fine young men, whose lives might have enhanced the glory of their country in literature, art, and science, have been sent hither and yon to be crippled for life or to die in agony. The truth about reasons for warfare was well expressed by Lloyd George after World War I:

> Wars are precipitated by motives which the statesmen responsible for them dare not publicly avow. A public discussion would drag these motives in their nudity into the open, where they would die of exposure to the withering contempt of humanity.

Fact Number Seven is that, in spite of protestations and declarations extolling the desirability of peace made by governments composed of men, innumerable treaties of peace ratified by governments composed of men, Alliances more or less Holy made by men, a World Court maintained by governments composed of men and a League of Nations whose officials were all men, peace has been forced into the background and wars have continued until at this time the most savage and frightful war in all history has brought the world to the very edge of a bottomless abyss—and all under the leadership of men.

Is it not time that the other half of the human race —the women—should speak with authority about affairs which concern them so vitally? For every child that is born, the mother descends into the valley of the shadow of death. Yet when the sons reach the age of young manhood and a war threatens, it is the older men who decide the draft, the mothers and sons having nothing to say about the disposition of those precious lives. Is that democracy? Or is it tyrannous dictatorship?

When we realize that war is irrational and demoralizing, and that it is incompatible with democracy, with religion, with civilization *and with sane thinking,* what are we to think of an androcentric society? Years ago, twenty years or more before the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment, Henry B. Blackwell, husband of Lucy Stone, said that women were needed in the nation's housekeeping. He elaborated on that, calling attention to the long generations through which women had learned to manage household affairs on a more or less restricted budget, and saying that the nation was in reality a large household which needed the careful hand and brain of the economically trained housewife to help in administering its affairs. Scant attention was paid to this sound advice which, if followed, would have brought about the anthropocentric, fully human society needed to keep governments balanced and to prevent warfare.

Who can give a good reason why women should not share equally with men the responsibilities of national government? They are equal in mental ability to men. As a class they are known to be superior in the attributes or characteristics of the higher spiritual nature. Can it be that the real reason why women are not more largely represented today in government and as delegates to peace conferences is because men are afraid of the strength of women's convictions regarding warfare and the diplomatic intrigues and secret international commitments which lead to periodic cataclysmic strife?

We are warned that World War III will materialize unless drastic changes are made in international procedures. It would seem that Col. Edward House was more than half serious when he said after World War I that men had made such a mess of governments that they should resign in favor of women; and it is evident that Henry Ford's remark in July, 1944, has the ring of sincerity: "Maybe the women should be running the world. I believe they could do a better job." Perhaps a gynecocentric society would be better; it could hardly be worse than the present androcentric one.

This is not to say that there are not men who have the vision, who could pull the world out of its present impasse. There are; and they can be found in many lands. But they have not been those who have held the power. And war must be outlawed now if civilization is to survive. Even Churchill admits this. In his report to the House of Commons, he said:

> Another great war, especially an ideological war, fought, as it would be, not only on frontiers but in the heart of every land, with weapons far more destructive than men have yet wielded, will spell doom perhaps for such civilization as men have been able to erect since History began to be written.

Will the fact, known to all now, that even the largest cities could be entirely reduced to rubble in a few minutes by the cataclysmic bombs which would be the weapons of a future war, and their citizens buried or burned alive, affect the thinking and plans of rulers of empires? But if women were equal in authority, what then?

It is said by some that women are no more opposed to war than men are. I think that is not true. If women held the positions of power in governments that are now held by men, and a dispute should arise between nations, would these women, by a declaration of war, send their husbands and sons to be blown to bits on battlefields or in airplanes? There is but one answer: They would not. The dispute would be settled by arbitration or in a

World Court. A noted English educator, George Arundale, has written that if women had the say about war there would be no war. And a noted author has recently written of women as "the sex whose passion for order and security is the primal source of civilization."

It is a disgrace, which I believe most women recognize as most men do not, that the world should have progressed so far toward civilization without having abolished warfare utterly long before now. It is a disgrace that complete destruction of the world is threatened by scientific invention before the moral sense of mankind should arise and demand the cessation of collective homicide. Had women been more aggressive by nature, less submissive to the status quo, less guided by the opinions of the dominant male; had they in past years been more conversant with statecraft, they would long ago have rebelled against the criminal waste by war of the earth's material riches and the tyranny and incredible cruelty of war's holocaust.

That both World War I and World War II could have been prevented is widely known. If the male attitude continues to dominate in world affairs, what evidence have we that present policies will be changed so drastically that warfare will be outlawed for the future. The United Nations Charter does not outlaw war.

To outlaw warfare is a colossal undertaking and will never be accomplished if the masculine viewpoint alone is allowed to hold sway. I plead for women delegates at the peace table and for equal participation of women in governments. As Emily Balch has said: "Fundamental to all else is the need that men should grow to understand and practice patience and tolerance, and come to substitute for the clumsy, uncertain, cruel tools of violence, the methods of reason and coöperation." I believe the influence of women would tend toward the fulfillment of that need.

Mutualism For Increasing Democracy

LEO HIRSCH

Biologists have known for many years that the maintenance of life in any form is dependent upon the operation of two basic principles. The fundamental purposes of any living organism are encompassed in the two great life activities of growth and reproduction. But there is no single living organism, from man to the amoeba, capable of realizing these aims, of accomplishing these purposes, without ceaseless struggle against the environment. It is true that at given moments, the outcome of this struggle may vary. Sometimes the organism succeeds in subduing the environment. More often, victory is obtained only at the price of adaptation on the part of the organism. In either case, however, the process is identical. Neither adaptation nor conquest can be achieved without struggle.

In human terms, we have come to think of this struggle as competition. It is a wheel of life that is ceaselessly turning. In the complex world in which we live, its driving force may take a thousand different forms, but every form conceals the same indestructible core of ruthless power.

Yet if it is true to say that the maintenance of life is dependent upon struggle, or competition, it is equally true to say that without cooperation, life must and will perish. Here we come to the second basic principle that is illustrated in the history of organic evolution. Life itself began with one-celled organisms, each one of them for countless ages living its own individual one-celled life, each fighting and struggling for itself alone. But slowly, through the ages, there developed the process of association of cells for mutual benefit. So gradual was this process that it was imperceptible, but it was revealed in its results. For out of this slow and gradual association and cooperation developed the higher forms of organic life, until the process achieved the stage that we experience and know in human history—the evolution of man. Of the billions of cells that compose the human body, each lives its own individual life, carefully separated from its neighbors by a cell wall, but at the same time carrying on constant communication and cooperation with all the other cells. These cells unite to form tissues, and the tissues form themselves into organs. Each organ performs a different function, but does so in cooperation with all of the other organs, the whole of them uniting to form the human body, through which human personality is possible.

Thus has mankind in its present stage of civilization been achieved. Partly by struggle, or competition, and partly by cooperation, or mutualism. Such is the biologist's view of human life, based on long decades of study and observation.

Politically, socially, and economically, the world is today facing a critical and precarious situation. This is clearly indicated by the questions that are being asked, the problems that are being posed on all sides. Can free enterprise and free competition meet the needs of the democratic world that our boys fought for? Can they meet the demands of all the people in terms of a larger purpose and plan? Can they shape our lives and our future in a way to satisfy the creative and spiritual hungers resulting from the chaos of this war? One way or another, our political, industrial, educational, and religious leaders must answer these questions, and answer them soon. We submit that those among our leaders who are willing to look objectively at the biological view of life will find more than one important clue to the solutions for which the people are so earnestly praying.

Some of our leaders have already answered the questions that the whole world is asking. Through such powerful organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers, and the United States Chamber of Commerce, those men who control and rule the economic destinies of our nation have already made ringing affirmation of their faith. Free enterprise and free competition, according to them, offer the one hope of saving a crumbling economic world. The fact that our present economic system, grounded as it is upon so-called free enterprise and free competition, led to the ten-year depression of the 1930s, with its insecurity and exploitation, its unemployment and human suffering, and that it surely precipitated World War II with its frightful human mutilation and losses is conveniently

forgotten by these powerful rulers of our economic fate. Nor does their disingenuousness end here. In their effort to prove that planning by the state in order to avoid the above evils can lead only to Fascism, they are insisting upon a misleading and utterly false identification of Socialism as practised by the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and Fascism as exemplified in Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy. The cry of these gentlemen and their highly paid press hirelings is always the same. Communism and Fascism, according to them, are one and the same thing, both leading to the enslavement of the people. And in some curious way, national planning in an established political democracy is the danger mark—let the government begin to plan, and the gate is immediately opened for the coming of Communism, which is the same thing as Fascism, only probably a good deal worse. We are all familiar with the argument, for we have read and heard it a dozen times. Perhaps its most celebrated exponent at the moment is the exiled Austrian economist, Professor F. A. Hayek, whose book, *The Road to Serfdom,* has become a best seller among the bourgeois capitalists and their supporters. Herbert Hoover and Eric Johnson alike have written enthusiastic comments on this superficial, illogical, and disingenuous little treatise.

The false and undialectical nature of the argument can be readily understood with a little analysis. Monopoly capitalism was never destroyed in either Germany or Italy, and thus the masses of both countries were enslaved to a small group of landlords and industrialists who were supported by strong military organizations. To a lesser degree, the same thing happened in other countries of Europe, notably Poland and Rumania,—and in the Far East, Japan is an outstanding example of it. In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, monopoly capitalism was ruthlessly destroyed, and it was precisely for the purpose of accomplishing this that the political dictatorship of the people was established. Thus we find that Nazism or Fascism, and Communism, far from being identical, are poles apart in aim and purpose. The aim of the former is to increase the power of the monopoly capitalists, and to keep the masses enslaved, while the aim of the latter is to lift the masses of the common people to ever higher levels of physical, mental, and spiritual development. Some indication of how successfully each philosophy has realized its particular purpose may be obtained by comparing the achievements in science of the Soviet Union with those of Germany under Hitler, or Italy under Mussolini. Or one can compare the position of women under Russian Communism with the degraded condition into which women were forced under Hitler in Germany. Or one can compare the practical banishment of illiteracy in the vast reaches of the Soviet domain with the burning of books, the closing of schools and universities, and the exiling of professors and teachers in Nazi Germany.

The misleading attempt on the part of the economic leaders of our country to identify two completely different political systems with each other—i.e., Fascism and Communism—has naturally confused the issue that is at stake in the bitter ideological struggle now going on. The issue is not, as these gentlemen would have us suppose, between Communism on the one hand and democracy on the other. Rather, the issue is that between Socialism and individualism. Or, to put it another way, between the principle of untrammeled competition, and the principle of mutual cooperation. Nor is the issue as completely a clear-cut one as the enthusiastic supporters of economic royalism would have us believe. Individualism, free enterprise, free competition—call it what you will—does not, in and of itself, bring economic equality or opportunity to all. The value of the system is that it puts a premium on personal initiative. It is, after all, through the full and free play of personal initiative that human personality develops. On the other hand, with the tremendous concentration of wealth in corporations and cartels that we have today, do we really have a free enterprise system at all? Is it not true that the power of social control has passed from our political government to our huge corporations, with their lobbyists and pressure groups in Washington? Thinking people cannot answer this question in any other way than affirmatively. The founding fathers of our country placed all their emphasis on political equality, thinking thereby to insure economic equality to all. The development of monopoly capitalism has proved their dream but a shadow, without the substance of realization.

The dominant characteristic of monopoly capitalism is large scale power production—i.e., production by water, steam, or electricity. Its distinguishing feature is acquisitiveness—the aim of acquiring and holding and then acquiring again. In the ruthless pursuit of this aim, all except the small handful of monopoly capitalists themselves are exploited and become the victims of the power of monopoly, in land, industry, and finance.

Suppose we could create a free enterprise economy with a free competitive system and help it to function. There would be free exchange of goods and services with other nations. Prices would be governed by the cost of production, and equitable wages would be incorporated and keyed to a full employment program. Complete regulation of capital and money would insure the absence of greedy monopoly. All natural resources would be socialized in order to insure this, and for the same purpose there would be strict regulation of patent rights. Capital investment would be limited to a return of 3 percent. This is an economic system that we have never had, but if we did achieve it, then we could claim to have created the beginnings of a democratic way of life and the economic justice basic to it.

We need a democratic system in which political responsibility and economic responsibility are united and operating for the liberation of man's creative genius. In order to accomplish this, such elements of Socialism as have long since been proved to be sound and helpful to our society and that can operate without regimentation must be retained and expanded. Our postal system, our public health and sanitation service, our system of public education, and such vast forms of public enterprise as the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the operation of Boulder Dam are all examples. At the same time, individual initiative and enterprise must be ceaselessly encouraged, in order that those moral and spiritual elements in man's nature that have played such an important role in human progress be not destroyed. To accomplish this, government must always play the role of silent partner, always in the background with counsel and assistance, always regulatory instead of dictatorial, always mindful of human values as the determining element, and always championing the greater interest of all the people. The political freedom that was acquired by the Western World in the great eighteenth century of revolution—

the French Revolution and the American Revolution—could, if properly used, achieve all of this.

Because the winning of political equality in the eighteenth century was not accompanied by the securing of economic equality, we of today have had to live through a "Thirty Years" war that has had its roots in revolution. The causes are largely due to the decay of the capitalist system which, in its declining period, has forced economic nationalism and the growth of ever-greater monopolies on the world. So aggressive and violent did this development become that even the mild parliamentary democracy of Germany and Italy was not tolerated. Fascism, arising in all its ruthless brutality, made war the end and aim of all policy.

Thus, what we are experiencing today is not a struggle between democracy and Communism, but rather a life-and-death conflict between monopoly capitalism and those forms of Socialism that must be adopted in order to create genuine free enterprise.

For us, the resolution of this conflict must be the maintenance of our political equality together with the achievement of economic equality. It is at precisely this point that we can find important clues to the solution of the problem in the biologist's view of life. For it teaches us that the very maintenance of life itself is dependent upon the simultaneous operation of two basic principles—that of competition on the one hand, and that of cooperation on the other. Only by recognizing and making use of these two principles can we put an end to the exploitation of millions of men, women, and children, to our periodic waves of unemployment and agricultural depression, to the misdirection of our finance and the wasteful mismanagement of our vital industries. There must be some degree of public supervision and control over rents, land uses, many kinds of food, transportation, and communication. The oil, coal, iron, and steel industries must be nationalized, and our natural resources must be placed under public control. Bitterly as capitalism in its monopoly form has fought it, this is only the mildest type of Socialism, such as has existed for many years in Australia and New Zealand, and in the Scandinavian countries—all nations whose citizens have at the same time enjoyed political freedom and democracy no less extensive than our own.

All depends upon an accord between democracy and Socialism, between the rights of the individual and the claims of society on a new and creative synthesis of freedom and equality.

It must be remembered that cooperation does more than sum up the combined powers of those who cooperate. It multiplies those powers, sometimes to a vast extent. The energy generated in a modern power plant is vastly more than the combined energies of those who have taken part in generating that power. So, cooperation is a creative process, bringing into existence powers and achievements far beyond the sum total of the individual powers of the cooperators. Against genuine intelligently planned cooperation, individual action is relatively insignificant and impotent.

The solution to the struggle between government control and private monopoly which now threatens to engulf the whole capitalistic world may well be brought through a synthesis of the best features of the Russian system on the one hand, and of the Anglo-American system on the other. The political equality that has been achieved in the Anglo-American system must be preserved and extended. So also must the economic equality that has been accomplished under the Soviet system. And the two must be made to work together.

The solution to the problem lies in the hands of the people, who must finally choose.

The best hope of democracy lies in a free enterprise in which the principles of competition and cooperation are fused, in which government is a silent, helpful partner, and in which government, management, and labor are constantly planning and working together for the general welfare.

No Victory Is Complete

KENNETH L. PATTON

The Victory is ours. The end we have been seeking for long, hard years is here. The constant excitement of the battle news, the tension, the urgency of the great mission is over with the end of the mission. The obstacles were huge, the distances great, the supply problems fantastic, the cost demanded in lives, in postponed plans, in sacrifice of wealth was bitter. But we faced the odds and overcame them; we considered the price not too great for the desired end. It now seems wise that we should pause to consider what it is that we have won and on what grounds we deserve the victory. Was the victory ours because of greater might, or greater right, or a just combination of both these? Was the victory due to our own efforts or to chance? Should we consider ourselves the moral superiors of the defeated nations? How shall we measure this victory?

Guilty as were all the parties on both sides of this struggle, the opinion hardly seems warranted that all were equally guilty. Wavering as was the pointer on the scale of merit, it fell to one side more often than to the other. There can be little doubt as to who wanted this war, who began preparing for it, who started it. Most of the United Nations had curtailed their armaments. Their people wanted none of war. Their desire for peace led them into disastrous policies of appeasement. Even Russia, most realistic of the peace-loving nations, would have preferred to have put more of her production to peacetime goods than she dared. She armed only to forestall the storm she saw rising in the Fascist countries. The peace-mindedness of the peoples of the United Nations was the greatest advantage the Axis nations had. The rest of the world was turning away from conquest and empire when those who were to become our enemies turned again to it.

The astounding thing is not that we were aroused to fight when we did, but that our patience and tolerance were as long as they were. Our major shame now is that we allowed the rape of Manchuria, Ethiopia, China, Spain, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Norway, and France, and still the American people did not openly declare their side and join the struggle. We waited until our own soil was attacked

and war was declared upon us. Whatever may be the secrets of diplomacy, those are the evident facts of the overt scene.

The first victory we won was a victory over ourselves. The democracies were flabby, unsure of themselves. The depression and our inability to really solve the unemployment problem, the slackening morale of free people, the incipient Fascism in our own land, the division of opinion and loyalties, had affected our self-respect. We were told that we were too weak, too ill-prepared to fight a world war, that we had failed to solve our own internal problems and would fail even more shamefully if we tried to settle the difficulties of the world. Could democracies organize themselves freely as efficiently as dictators could organize the manpower and economy of a Fascist nation? Would totalitarian propaganda, regimentation and planning produce a unified power against which the disorganized democracies would be ineffective? Could they divide and rule? The question that was settled was whether dictatorships or democracies could better fight the war.

We answered those questions. We beat them on every front, in the factory, in the air, on the sea, and on land. We outplanned them and outfought them. Starting with a terrific handicap, with a military inferiority thoroughly demonstrated in France and in the early months in the Pacific, we conquered greater problems of distance and time than our enemies faced, and defeated them overwhelmingly. There can be no doubt of our industrial and military victory.

In order to win the industrial and military victories, we had to prove the effectiveness of democracies in other fields. We proved that free peoples with differences of opinion can work together when the need is great. We organized ourselves freely until we outstripped the Fascists in integration of effort and efficiency. We did it with a minimum of coercion and, in this country, without even a labor draft. We did it without sacrificing our political democracy. The English put aside politics for the duration and the parties tackled the common task together. In America we showed the world that a democracy can continue the internal rivalry of party political opposition without affecting the common front it presents to an enemy. We showed that with the death of an able leader we could shift to a new leader without a slip. The British have shown that democratic people, honoring their war leader as they did, still had a mind of their own about the kind of a world they wanted in peace, that they honor their self-appointed servants but do not worship them.

It is hard to know how much of our success was due to our natural advantages in wealth, man power, industrial skill and strength, and how much was due to our democratic way of life. It would be dangerous to discount our philosophy, manner of government, and ways of living as contributing nothing to our victory. We can at least say that whereas the Fascists claimed the democracies were decadent, we have proved ourselves to be more vigorous and healthy than they. In this military victory the democratic way has been to some degree vindicated.

The cause of human decency and moral principles has also been strengthened. We did not stoop to all the weapons of our enemies. We had no murder camps. We did not exterminate minorities, and with a few unhappy exceptions, we respected the neutrality of the non-belligerents. Our occupation of Iceland, a military necessity, was in no way comparable to, say, the occupation of Norway. We did not recruit slave labor, run concentration camps or kill hostages. The Japanese-American relocation centers were poles apart from Buchenwald. As to these matters we may not be able to speak for Russia and China, both dictatorships. The reports on labor and concentration camps in those two nations are so conflicting that we have to admit that they may have been all too like those of the enemy. We saw racial equality advance in our armed forces and in industry with the F.E.P.C. We fed the conquered peoples, whereas the Fascists stripped them, and now we have undertaken the task of rebuilding the world. Above all, even while the battles were raging, we created the United Nations agreement, which may well be the beginning of a lastingly peaceful world. We come out of the war with a greater hope for decency and peace than we had when the war began.

We can have reason to hope that our victory was also a vindication of a way of life. It demonstrated that the populations of the democracies were made up of strong, determined, courageous people, people of independence and responsibility. We showed the ability of free peoples to work together. The close-knit cooperation of the forces of the United Nations did more than anything else to insure Hitler's defeat. If we had not been able to work together, he would have beaten us one by one. Our men and women proved to be intelligent, hardy and resourceful. Without being wanton in the waste of life, we were not, as the enemy had prophesied, less willing than they to die for what we believed to be right.

It was not completely an accident that our invention proved superior to that of the dictator powers. The Germans proved in their exile of great scientists, in allowing racial and other prejudices to interfere with scientific data, that their philosophy obstructed rather than abetted the advance of science and invention. Many great scientists, some of them directly responsible in our winning the race to the atomic bomb, were exiles from Nazi Germany. The Japanese have also admitted that internal factions and lack of the scientific attitude hampered their research. The free, undogmatic spirit of democracy is directly connected in attitude and underlying philosophy to the philosophy and spirit of science. The individualism and freedom of enterprise of industrial organization proved more effective in the long run than the totalitarian organization of production. We overwhelmed our enemy with a flood of machines and explosives. The weapons we possessed, as a result of our scientific and industrial competence at the end of the war, the miracles of radar, air power, rockets, sea power, transport, the power of an army of skilled technicians and scientists, and finally the atomic bomb, left the enemy at our mercy. It permitted us a victory without invasion, without the meeting of the main armed forces of the belligerents, something new in human history. The moral aspects of our scientific and technological victory should not be ignored.

We won another victory, a victory of mercy and healing. The victory was also won in the rooms where the women rolled bandages, in the blood banks, in the hospitals where the nurses' aid took over, in the medical research laboratories, with the sulfas and penicillin and DDT, with atabrine and plasma, with the miracles of plastic surgery, new methods of convalescence and treatment of nervous disorders. Medicine saved the adding of millions of lives to the lists of the dead.

We won an economic victory. By price control, labor mediation, rationing, in spite of abuses, we kept our economy stable, prevented inflation, and distributed the

goods we had with notable equality. We protected the jobs of the servicemen and set up intelligent machinery whereby they can be restored to a normal life. Industry has grown in intelligence and responsibility in meeting its social obligations. Labor, in America, England, and in Canada, continued to grow in power, in economic and political effectiveness. Our government met the stupendous demands made upon it for organization and administration. Our economic victory extends into the post-war world, into UNRRA, the provisions for a monetary agreement and world cooperation in food, transportation and rehabilitation.

Finally, we won a victory for law and order. We have been so zealous to adhere to legal process during the war that people who would have been summarily shot, had they been active in Germany or Japan, have escaped persecution or been pardoned here. We are doing our best to see that the trial of war criminals shall follow the traditions of our civil courts and be strictly just and impartial. When the army in this country tried to use the death penalty for some traditional military offenses, they were forced by public protest to modify the ancient barbarities of the military legal code. The mercy of Lincoln has become the will of the people. Our military occupation so far has been restrained and constructive, the main fear being that we will be so easy as to be ineffective. Fortunately, we have few Bull Halsey's among our high command to advertise their brutal lack of taste and humanity.

That, in brief, is part of the victory won. We did what we set out to do. In this recounting I have been knowingly optimistic, giving the advantage of the doubt in several instances to hopefulness. Surely this catastrophe has not been entirely meaningless, wholly without benefit. Some things have been decided, and those we believe on the side of righteousness rather than evil. The chief victory has been to accord to the democratic peoples another chance to effect a free and prosperous world. The chief thing won has been opportunity. We have kept the door open, which if we had lost, according to Hitler, would have been closed on freedom for a thousand years. That is not a small attainment. That is the possession for which we must humbly thank the men and women who toiled and died in this most horrible of all wars. We can add a possible victory to this list, a victory which only time can prove whether it is ours or not. This may have been in actuality the war which will have ended all war. This may have been the final lesson to graduate mankind into their maturity, wherein they can achieve lasting peace and cooperation. The hope is a great one, and sometimes such a hope can provide the spirit whereby it becomes reality. If we believe this can be, we can do it.

There are new things under the sun, Ecclesiastes to the contrary. Radar, air power, rockets, and atomic energy have created an entirely new world in military terms. The V-2 rocket bombs were admittedly unstoppable. They went too high and their speed was too great to counteract them. If Germany had perfected them a year earlier, the outcome might have been reversed. With radar we could drop bombs and shoot with incredible accuracy. In radar the machine has gained eyes and ears, and in other mechanisms it seems almost as if we had created metal brains. Will the day come when we can carry a little box around in our hat to do our thinking for us? A hundred airplanes or radio-directed, pilotless craft, with atomic bombs, could wipe out the heart of a great nation in one sneak attack, if undetected. Combine the V-2 rocket with an atomic bomb—the prospect is fearful. Flesh and blood can stand only so much. The time has come, this time for sure, when man must cease warfare or be wiped off the earth. The Japanese had the alternative of surrender or obliteration. Mankind now has the alternative of peace or obliteration.

The horror of this prospect will not alone insure peace. The ultimate fate for the individual is no worse than when in prehistoric times men slew each other with stone and club. The risk is still death, the difference being that the risk is now the death of the race and not just a few individuals. We cannot deny the possibility that a madman seeking control of the world might gamble on winning before he had himself been destroyed. That was the gamble made in this war, and it could be made again.

We must couple responsibility to fear. We must develop order, control, and law whereby the affairs of the earth can be creatively conducted, and whereby we can protect ourselves from international lawlessness. The time has come for world order, for world union, for world federation. If in this war and in the conferences conducted while it was being won, we have laid the foundation for this, history will name the victory we have won as the victory over war itself.

No victory is complete. There are many victories not yet won. Some of these are victories over ourselves, some over factors in our social life, economy, and international relations. It may serve a creative purpose to temper our optimism by reviewing some of our failures and some of the obstacles that still stand between us and continued safety from war.

We have not yet solved the economic problems which still beset us when the war pushed them into the background. We have not yet found the way best to distribute the wealth that a scientific and industrial age makes possible. We still have the feelings, philosophy, and practice of a day when material wealth was scarce. Now that we could have plenty for all, we do not know how to share it. This war which we have won is but a part of a vaster revolution, a deeper battle. That victory is still ours to attain. It will be won only when all the peoples of the earth have the food, housing, clothing, medicine, and the cultural advantages that are within easy possibility. The war has shown us that our productive power knows no practical limits. The solving of the ancient needs of the flesh, the basic physical necessities, must be our first goal.

Coupled to that, and indeed inseparable from it, is the need for a victory over social injustice. The class distinctions in trade, race, nationality, the lingering of the colonial structure in Asia, Africa, and the Islands, foster the poverty and needless ignorance of millions. Our economic problems are social problems, and we can never win one victory without at the same time winning the other. The fight for democracy and freedom is not yet won, not when the British go back into Hong Kong and Singapore and the French into Indo-China, not when Negro slaves still work in the mines of South Africa, not when racial persecution persists in our own country, even in our own city.

The victory yet to be won is a victory over ourselves, over our own greed, spurious superiority, pride, and inhumanity. In spite of the nobility which the men and women who represented us in the war have enacted, we have shown ourselves to be all too human, to be capable of littleness, bigotry, boorishness, and too often we have matched horror with horror and even exceeded the slaughter of our enemies. We have yet to make a clear

case that the holocaust of Hamburg, the systematic destruction of Germany and Japan, and finally the blotting out of two whole cities with atomic bombs, can be justified in military or humanistic terms. We have not conducted this war as moral heroes, but perhaps wars, by their very nature, do not lend themselves to moral qualifications.

Other things we might have done and did not do. We have made endless compromises with Fascist-minded powers, in Spain, North Africa, France, Italy. We have not always been true to the issues and ideals for which we professed to be fighting. The issues inherent in the rival ideologies of democracy and totalitarianism have not been always clearly drawn. In this war halfway democracies fought halfway Fascist states. Those unincorporated and rebellious minorities who made up the undergrounds of France, Italy, Spain, Germany, and Japan are the seed and hope of democracy in those countries. The Fascist individuals and groups in the so-called democracies, on the other hand, are the main threat to a free world. They are the compromisers, the underminers, the focal infections debilitating democratic societies. This Fascist-mindedness is to be found in all our agencies, in politics, religion, education and business. Until we ourselves have learned to live and feel and act the ideals of our democracy, we have a very crucial victory yet to win.

A major victory not yet won is that of rehabilitating the world. Will our occupation of the conquered countries advance the esteem of democracy, or blacken its eye? We hear about American business-men stealing inventions and raiding the business of Europe, using our occupying military personnel to aid them. Our lingering hatred and bitterness may lead us to indulge in childish revenge at the expense of objectively and unemotionally setting about the engineering problem of creating a world economy where all men, our enemies included, can find justice and plenty. Our selfishness may keep us from sharing our wealth with the needy, building up barriers of envy and resentment between us and the poverty-stricken peoples over whose lands we fought this war.

We can only touch on another victory not yet won. The United Nations Charter is only a bare beginning of a world governing organization. In it nations still guard their outworn sovereignty. The big nations still lord it over the small. The imperial powers are allowed to retain their colonies. We have only won the first skirmish in the creation of a world of equality and freedom. Only with a tremendous and sustained evolution, by a succession of creative, liberal, and equalitarian amendments, can the charter we now have, and the organization that will function under it, develop into that United States of the World that will possess the structure, power, and idealism to relegate war to its place among the discarded barbarities of a civilized humanity.

The victory yet to be won is the victory over our immaturity as culture-building creatures. We are no better than adolescents at self-government, if we can accord ourselves even that much maturity. We are children, and often scarcely wiser children than those with whom we have been doing battle. This is the great dream and adventure for tomorrow, the winning of maturity by the human race.

INTIMATE MEMORIES OF LINCOLN

Assembled and Annotated by

RUFUS ROCKWELL WILSON

629 pp. Price $5.00

"This volume, a valuable companion to Wilson's **Lincoln Among His Friends,** is based on original sources and contains a record of the memories of many of the persons who knew Lincoln best. Students of Lincoln will find it useful as a source book and the general reader will get new insights into the life and work of this great American. There is a good index."

Curtis W. Reese, Dean,
Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago.

Other Lincoln Volumes by Rufus Rockwell Wilson soon to be published:

The new edition of **Lincoln in Caricature** will be limited to 600 signed and numbered copies of which 550 will be offered for sale; and there will be no reprinting of it during the lifetime of the author. Engraving, printing, paper, and binding will be in keeping with the best traditions of bookmaking. The orders will be filled in strict accordance with the date of receipt. The price is $7.50 a volume, and libraries and historical societies will be accorded the usual 20 per cent discount.

The Uncollected Works of Lincoln is intended as a supplement in four volumes to Nicolay and Hay and contains some 1200 items not included in that work. It will be uniform in format and binding with the 1905 Tandy edition of Nicolay and Hay. The first printing will consist of 1250 numbered sets, of which 1200 will be offered for sale at $20 a set or $5.00 a volume on delivery. Libraries will be accorded the usual discount. It is planned to issue the first four volumes on February 12, 1946, and the remaining three at half-yearly intervals.

THE PRIMAVERA PRESS, INC.

610 West Church Street, Elmira, New York

The Study Table

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Tom Paine Again

TOM PAINE, AMERICA'S GODFATHER. *By W. E. Woodward. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company. $3.50.*

This is not the best biography of Tom Paine. Moncure D. Conway's two-volume masterpiece still holds the lead, and I like immensely Mary Agnes Best's work of some years ago. But Mr. Woodward's book, if not the best biography, is certainly the "fightingest." Mr. Woodward got mad over the gross injustice still being done to "the most unjustly maligned figure in our national history." Especially, I think, was he angered by Howard Fast's *Citizen Tom Paine,* published two years ago, which, under the guise of eulogy, did more damage to Paine's reputation than can be estimated. So he pitched in to do once more a work of rehabilitation, and a fine job it is.

Mr. Woodward goes over the familiar ground conscientiously and thoroughly. He emphasizes the right points, and makes abundantly plain the indispensable work that Paine did for the American Revolution, which could not have been won without him, and the priceless service he rendered the cause of liberty not only here but in England and France as well. His three books, *Common Sense, The Rights of Man,* and *The Age of Reason,* are sympathetically analyzed and justly described as among the great revolutionary utterances of all time. A clear picture is given of the period in which Paine flourished and his notable place therein. In an era which knew Washington, Franklin and Jefferson, Burke and Fox, Lafayette and Mirabeau, Thomas Paine ranked among the first.

Mr. Woodward's book is especially valuable not only for its careful and convincing refutation of the slanders directed against Paine, but also for its explanation of how these slanders ever came into being. Tom Paine was not a perfect character, but he was brave, generous, an unfaltering champion of liberty, a pioneer advocate of humanitarian causes, and the greatest pamphleteer of all time, Voltaire perhaps alone excepted. It was his Tory opponents, who resented and feared his love of democracy, and orthodox religionists, who revolted against his sweeping attacks upon bigotry and superstition, who conspired to denounce him as a drunkard, a dirty clown, an anarchist, and an atheist. Paine was none of these things. But the mud, especially as flung from highly respectable quarters, stuck. And to this day the work of cleaning has not washed it all away. Mr. Woodward's water is fresh from the springs of truth, his soap is carbolic. Together they do an acid job, and Paine stands forth a nobler figure than ever before.

Anti-Semitism

MUST MEN HATE. *By Sigmund Livingston. New York: Harper & Brothers. 344 pp. $2.50.*

It is impossible to praise this book too highly. For one thing, it is such a complete job! The author undertakes to present a survey of the mythology of anti-Semitism, and to answer point by point the great variety of libels and slanders, canards and hoaxes, silly and momentous charges of one kind and another, which have grown up, like foul weeds in a garden, through centuries of prejudice, and persecution directed against the Jews. The result is a veritable anthology of superstition, much of it ignorant, more of it wicked, all of it baseless.

Mr. Livingston begins by showing how anti-Semitism is unconsciously sown in the minds of little children by invidious references to Jews as a contemptuous or merely "different" people. The influence of literature plays havoc with the growing mind. Then come the great historic libels—the ritual of blood accusation, the Protoctols of Zion, the Talmud charges, the Benjamin Franklin forgery, the Dreyfus Case, the Bolshevist lie, and of course the "Jews killed Jesus" myth—all of which are set forth in these pages and answered with scrupulous detail. A third chapter deals with the riff-raff of common talk about Jews, which sprouts like

(*Continued on page* 143)

The Field

(*Continued from page* 130)

3. Freedom of Assemblage; Picketing

Meetings in public places, parades, and processions should be freely permitted, the only reasonable regulation being the advance notification to the police of time and place. No discretion should be given the police to prohibit parades or processions, but merely to alter routes in accordance with the imperative demands of traffic in crowded cities.

There should be no laws or regulations prohibiting the display of particular flags or other political emblems. The wearing of military uniforms, private military training, and masked parades may properly be prohibited to prevent prospective violence or intimidation.

The right to picket is involved in the right of assemblage. Peaceful picketing, therefore, even in large numbers and for any public purpose, should not be prohibited by injunction, or by police edict. It is the business of the police in places where picketing is conducted merely to keep traffic free and to preserve order.

4. Labors' Rights

The right of workers to organize in unions of their own choosing, and to strike, should not be infringed by law. Any injunction or use of military or police forces to restrict this right should be fought.

Protection of the right of workers to organize free from interference or coercion by employers, as provided in the national and state labor relations acts, should be supported and extended. But the administration of these acts should be so guarded as not to infringe upon employers' rights of free speech concerning unions, where not coercive.

Proposals for legislative control of trade union activities by compelling their incorporation and financial accounting or by delaying the right to strike by public notice should be opposed. But the rights of trade union members should be supported against discrimination on account of race or political views, and for democratic procedures in unions. Closed shop contracts should be opposed with unions which unreasonably restrict membership.

5. Law Enforcement in Strikes

Policing of strikes is a public function. The policing authorities should not deny civil rights to any portion of the community. That principle calls for the protection not only of organized workers but of non-union workers in their right of access to places of employment and to freedom from violence or forcible interference.

Martial law, frequently declared when state troops are called out, is usually unnecessary, and should be commonly opposed.

6. Race Equality

Every attempt to discriminate between races in the application of all principles of civil liberty here set forth will be opposed, as will all legal discriminations based on race.

7. The Right to a Fair Trial

Every person charged with an offense should have the fullest opportunity for a fair trial, and for obtaining counsel and bail in a reasonable sum. In the case

(*Continued on page* 143)

The Study Table

(*Continued from page* 142)

"seeds scattered on plowed soil," and does dreadful havoc in defaming a whole people and keeping the vile hatred of them alive. What this may come to has its dreadful illustration in Nazi Germany, where anti-Semitism established a government, and sustained a political and military regime through years of incalculable disaster. In the last half of his book, the author turns to the positive side, and tells us what the Jews have contributed to America and to our whole Western civilization. This leads in conclusion to a consideration of Judaism and Christianity, and of mass hatreds in general, and what can be done about an evil which threatens to devour us all.

Yes, Mr. Livingston has done a fine job. His great array of material, his skilful massing of his facts and arguments, his exemplary spirit, all are beyond praise, and combine to make this book the best treatise now available on the subject. Yet is the work a tragedy, from at least two points of view.

First, there is the tragedy that such a book has to be written. Think of a civilization which has not only tolerated but deliberately cultivated this miserable prejudice against a great and innocent people! In the light of the atomic bomb and its threat to our world, we may well ask ourselves if such a civilization, after all, is worth saving.

Secondly, there is the tragedy of what seems to be the naive assumption of the author that such material as he has so painstakingly gathered will make an impression upon the prejudiced mind. Is it not the very essence of prejudice that it is not susceptible to argument? What person, now hateful of the Jews, will read this book and be persuaded of his offense? No, the cure of anti-Semitism is not so easy. Like cancer, this scourge baffles alike our knowledge and our devotion.

Nonetheless, we must, as in the case of cancer, keep up our fight against it. Mr. Livingston shows the way. To him be praise and honor.

Books Received

ALL GOD'S CHILDREN. *By Armond E. Cohen. Published by The Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue, New York City. 104 pp. $1.50.*

BETWEEN TWO WARS. *By Porter Sargent. Published by Porter Sargent, 11 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass. 608 pp. $5.00.*

BEYOND THE HILLS OF TIME. *By Irene K. Surenson. Published by Harbinger House, 116 East 19th Street, New York City. 45 pp. $1.50.*

THE CONTINUING BATTLE. *By Porter Sargent. Published by Porter Sargent. 160 pp.*

THE HEART OF MAN. *By Gerald Vann. Published by Longmans, Green & Co., Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York City. 182 pp. $2.00.*

HIS TERRIBLE SWIFT SWORD. *By the Very Rev. Dr. Norman MacLean. Published by Christian Council on Palestine, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City. 126 pp. 25 cents.*

LET'S TALK ABOUT THE PEACE. *By Henry G. Alsberg. Published by Hastings House, 67 West 44th Street, New York City. 324 pp. $2.75.*

LETTERS OF RAINER MARIA RILKE, 1892-1910. *Translated by Jane Bannard Greene and M. D. Herter Norton. Published by W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City. 399 pp.*

THERE IS A SPIRIT. *By Kenneth Boulding. Published by Fellowship Publications, 2929 Broadway, New York City. 26 pp. 75 cents.*

THE VISION OF PIERS PLOWMAN. *By William Langland. Newly Rendered into Modern English by Henry W. Wells. Published by Sheed & Ward, 63 Fifth Avenue, New York City. 304 pp. $350.*

The Field

(*Continued from page* 142)

of a poor person, special aid should be organized to insure a fair trial, and, when necessary, an appeal. Efforts of the police to extort confessions by torture, the "third degree," should be fought.

8. Censorship

The many advance censorships by officials over movies, the theatre, and publications, should be abolished and control left wholly to the determination of juries in civil or criminal proceedings. Juries reflect current standards of decency far better than administrative officials.

9. Liberty in Education

Dismissals or discipline of teachers for expressions of opinion on public issues should be contested. Legislative measures to control what doctrines may or may not be taught should be opposed. So too should efforts to establish religion in public schools, as through the compulsory reading of the Bible or the prohibition of the teaching of evolution as contrary to the Bible. Compulsory patriotic exercises conflicting with religious or conscientious scruples should be opposed. Special oaths of loyalty for school teachers should be fought as attempts to regiment their views.

10. Search and Seizure

Arrests without warrant, and the seizure of papers and literature without legal process should be contested. Officials so violating constitutional guaranties should be proceeded against.

The tapping of telephone wires to obtain evidence violates the spirit of the constitutional guaranty, and should be fought.

11. Immigration, Deportation, and Passports

No alien should be refused admission to the United States on the ground of holding objectionable opinions. Present restrictions are wholly opposed to our tradition of political asylum.

No alien should be deported merely for beliefs or for membership in a particular organization.

Citizenship should not be refused to any alien because of radical or pacifist views which may legally be held by a citizen.

Revocation of naturalization because of political beliefs in order to effect deportation is a perversion of a law intended to cover only fraud.

Passports or visas should not be refused because of opinions or membership in any particular organization.

12. Political Rights

The right to vote should not be limited by property qualifications such as the poll tax. No political party should be denied a place on the ballot on account of its doctrines or program.

13. War Powers

The power of the government to require military or other service from citizens is conceded, but freedom of conscience demands provisions for the total exemption of those opposed to participation in war. While the power of the government is likewise conceded to effect removals from military areas of persons alleged to be dangerous to military security, it should be exercised only by civilian officials after individual hearings and without discrimination.

Wartime powers to intern enemy aliens, to control enemy agents, to censor communications abroad, to control foreign travel, and to withhold information likely to be of use to the enemy, do not raise any issues of civil liberty, except when unreasonably and arbitrarily applied.

—*Chicago Civil Liberties Committee.*

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

PHONE DIRECTORY

Heretofore all telephone service for the Conference and the Secretary has been through the Abraham Lincoln Centre switchboard. Private lines have now been secured for both the Conference Office and the Secretary's apartment. Note these numbers in your personal telephone directory:

Western Unitarian Conference—DRExel 8795.
Randall S. Hilton (Residence)—ATLantic 3769.

MR. HILTON'S FALL SCHEDULE

Sept. 9—Hinsdale, Illinois.
Sept. 16—Bloomington, Illinois.
Sept. 24—Western Conference Board Meeting.
Oct. 2—Chicago, 1st Church Alliance.
Oct. 5—Davenport, Iowa.
Oct. 7-12—Boston, Meetings of the A.U.A. Board, Regional Directors, Extension Department, Ministerial Union Executive Committee, etc.
Oct. 14—Rockford, Illinois.
Oct. 15-16—Indianapolis, Indiana (Workshop).
Oct. 17—Alton, Illinois.
Oct. 18-19—St. Louis, Missouri (Workshop).
Oct. 21—Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Oct. 23—Cedar Rapids, Iowa Conference.
Oct. 24-25—Chicago (Workshop).
Oct. 26—Evanston, Illinois.
Oct. 28—Chicago, Beverly Church—Ordination.
Oct. 29-30—Des Moines, Iowa (Workshop).
Nov. 1—Chicago, All Unitarian Dinner.
Nov. 4—Chicago, 3rd Church, Youth Rally.
Nov. 9-12—Kansas City, Missouri.
Nov. 13—Chicago Unitarian Council.
Nov. 14—Chicago—Noel Field Dinner.
Nov. 18—Cincinnati, Ohio, St. John's Church.
Nov. 26-27—Geneva Conference Board Meeting.
Nov. 27—Chicago, 1st Church, Tuesday Evening Club.
Dec. 3-4—Evanston (Ministers' Institute).
Dec. 6-7—Omaha, Nebraska (Ministers' Institute).
Dec. 9—Louisville, Kentucky, Clifton Church.
Dec. 16—Lawrence, Kansas.

MELVIN ARNOLD VISITS MID-WEST

Mr. Melvin Arnold, Director of the Division of Publications for the A.U.A., will visit St. Louis, Kansas City, and Chicago. Dr. Thaddeus Clark, St. Louis, is chairman of the Editorial Committee of the Division. R. Lester Mondale, Kansas City, is a member of the same committee. While in Chicago Mr. Arnold will attend a portion of the Ministers' Institute being held in Evanston.

MINISTERS' INSTITUTES

During the first full week in December two Ministers' Institutes will be held in the Western Conference, one at Evanston and one at Omaha. These are a part of a series of such institutes sponsored by the Unitarian Ministerial Union. Each Institute will conduct five discussion sessions on the following subjects: Unitarian Advance Theory, Unitarian Advance Practice, Making the Church Service Effective, Effective Democratic Organization, and Findings and Recommendation. The leaders of the Evanston sessions will be: Randall S. Hilton, E. T. Buehrer, E. Burdette Backus, Tracy Pullman, and John Nicholls Booth, General Chairman. The leaders in Omaha will be: R. Lester Mondale, Thaddeus B. Clark, Randall S. Hilton, Rudolph Gilbert, and John W. Cyrus, General Chairman.

PLEASE NOTE

It was announced in the last issue of UNITY that the Board of the Conference had voted to send UNITY, which includes the Western Conference News, to either the Director of the Church School or the Chairman of the Religious Education Committee in each church. So far we have received very few names and addresses of those who should receive it under this offer. We are asking the Minister and the Chairman, or Secretary, of the Board of each church to see that the proper name is sent to the Conference Office now. We want to start these gift subscriptions with the January issue.

BLOOMINGTON

Rev. Kenneth C. Walker will begin his ministry to the Unitarian Church of Bloomington, Illinois, on December 1. For the past ten years Mr. Walker has been minister of our church in Albany, N. Y. We are happy to welcome him and his family to the Western Unitarian Conference.

MENDELSOHN ORDAINED

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., was ordained to the Unitarian ministry on Sunday, October 28, at the Beverly Unitarian Church, Chicago. Mr. Mendelsohn became minister of the Beverly church in September, 1944, and received his divinity degree from Harvard University last June. Rev. Wallace W. Robbins, President of the Meadville Theological School, gave the charges to the minister and the congregation, and preached the sermon. Rev. Randall S. Hilton, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, gave the Welcome and the Ordination Prayer.

UNDERWOOD

The Underwood, Minnesota, Unitarian Church has invited the Rev. V. K. Bose, minister of the Willmar, Minnesota, Unitarian Society to be its minister also.

CHRISTMAS RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend the following books as excellent Christmas presents. They can be purchased through the Conference Office:

For Children:

The *Martin and Judy* Series—Vols. I, II, III.
Jesus, the Carpenter's Son, By Sophia Fahs (Jr. High).

For Adults:

God Can Wait, by Fred I. Cairns.
Hello, Man, by Kenneth L. Patton.
Men of Liberty, by Stephen H. Fritchman.
The Legacy of the Liberal Spirit, by Fred G. Bratton.

LAKE GENEVA CONFERENCE
August 11-18, 1946